

## REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are pending. There are no amendments submitted with this response. The only issue is whether the limitation “contact time in the reaction chamber is less than 0.1 seconds” complies with the adequate description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Support for this limitation includes the sentences at page 7, lines 5-7 which state: “The residence time is preferably less than 0.1 s. Short contact times are preferably 5-100 milliseconds (msec), more preferably 10-25 msec.” The specification also includes several examples in the range of 10 to 27 msec. Compliance with the written description requirement depends on whether the application “reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the later claimed subject matter.” *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563 quoting *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mor-Co Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1575, 227 USPQ 177, 179 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In *Ralston Purina*, the claims were amended to recite a temperature “in excess of 212° F” based on an example reciting a range of 212-360° F. The Federal Circuit upheld the lower court’s decision that the specification reasonably conveyed to the skilled artisan that the claimed process operating at a temperature “in excess of 212° F” was adequately described by a specification that generally described the temperature “being increased substantially” and the example reciting a range of 212-360° F. See *Ralston Purina*, 227 USPQ at 179, 183, 184. Therefore, analogous with the holding in *Ralston Purina*, the added limitation that “contact time in the reaction chamber is less than 0.1 seconds” is supported by the examples and the recited preferred range of 5 to 100 msec.

Furthermore, in the present case, the added limitation is even more clearly supported in the specification than in *Ralston Purina*. Applicants do not place a lower limit on residence time. Applicants’ original specification states that the residence time “is preferably less than 0.1 s.” “Residence time” defines the same reaction condition as “contact time” except that contact time is adjusted for temperature. See paragraph 3 of the Rule 132 Declaration of Dr. Yong Wang that was

submitted in applicants' most recent Amendment. Therefore, to the person skilled in the art, the fact that applicants did not require a lower limit on residence time clearly means that applicants did not require a lower limit on contact time.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions or would like to speak to Applicants' representative, the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicants' attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 13 Dec 2005

send correspondence to:  
Frank Rosenberg  
18 Echo Hill Lane  
Moraga, CA 94556  
fax. no. (925) 376-8429

By: Frank Rosenberg

Frank Rosenberg  
Registration No. 37,068  
tel: (925) 376-8416